

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 24 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner also rejected claims 1 - 7, 11, 15, 20 - 22, 25 - 31, 35, 39, and 44 - 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,145,898 (hereafter "Elliott") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,314,176 (hereafter "Gunasekar"). The Examiner further rejected claims 23 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott in view of Gunasekar and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,301,229 (hereafter "Araujo"). The Examiner also objected to claims 20 and 24 due to informalities.

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 25 to incorporate the language recited in claims 4 and 48, respectively. Accordingly, claims 4 and 48 are hereby canceled. The Applicant has also added new independent claim 54 by combining the allowable subject matter recited in dependent claim 24 with the subject matter recited in independent claim 1 prior to this amendment. The Applicant has amended claims 20 and 24 according to the Examiner's suggestions and, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of such. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the claim limitations associated with claims 24 and 28 and the language from the previous version of claims 4 and 48 and presents the following arguments in support of patentability.

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 11, 15, 16, and 20 - 24

In claim 1, the Applicant recites a system for providing an exchange of messages and associated data across a plurality of communication network system entities for a

plurality of communications networks. The claimed system includes, among other things, a distributed message broker that operates in a services control layer and is connectable to the plurality of communication network system entities of a plurality of communications networks. This distributed message broker limitation has been amended to incorporate the language of canceled claim 4 to further recite that the distributed message broker relays one or more messages to an appropriate destination based on at least one high-level name incorporated into the one or more messages.

The Examiner stated, in his rejection of claim 1, that Elliott discloses an ACD which is comparable to the message broker of the Applicant's claim. In this regard, the Examiner states that the ACD uses a VNET number with messaging so that the correct destination receives the connection message at column 101, lines 10 through 20 and column 101, lines 56 through 67 of Elliott. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Assuming for the sake of argument that the claimed high-level name is comparable to Elliott's VNET number, Elliott's handling of the VNET number is performed by the NCS/DAP 3 of Figure 19A - not by the ACD as the Examiner suggests.

Elliott differentiates between the NCS/DAP 3 and the ACD 4a at column 19, line 54 - column 20, line 30. Here, Elliott teaches that the NCS/DAP 3, being located outside the intelligence services network (ISN 4), provides for VNET numbers, VNET/950 card validation services and VNET ANI/DAL validation services. The ACD 4a, as part of the ISN4, is responsible for routing calls by communicating with the Intelligent Switch Network Adjunct Processor 5 to deliver calls to various agents. However, Elliot does not teach the ACD performing any type of VNET processing. The Applicant maintains that the message broker limitations of claim 1 (formerly of claim 4) patentably distinguish

over Elliott for at least these reasons. The Applicant also maintains that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over all of the cited references, either alone or in combination. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 5 - 11, 15, 16, and 20 - 24 depend from independent claim 1 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim. However, these claims require additional subject matter that further distinguish over the cited references. For example, in claim 23, the Applicant recites that the message broker further provides message tunneling for the one or more messages exchanged between the plurality of communications domains. The Examiner states that Araujo discloses message tunneling and realizes the benefit of more efficient management of data flows in a network by using tunneling. The Examiner further states that it would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of Araujo with the system and method of Elliott and Gunasekar. However, the Examiner does not properly illustrate the motivation to combine all three references.

The teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine must be found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The test for an implicit showing, as the Examiner suggests, is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. Araujo may realize a benefit of more efficient management of data flows in a network by using tunneling but Araujo is not trying to solve the same problem as Elliot (e.g., relaying and screening message

processing, service classifications, etc.). The Applicant maintains that there is no motivation to combine references, either explicit or implicit. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 23. Additionally, the Applicant maintains that claims 2, 3, 5 - 11, 15, 16, and 20 - 24 are also patentable for at least the reasons in favor of patentability for claim 1; the Applicant respectfully requests such disposition.

Regarding the Examiner's § 112, First Paragraph, rejection of claim 24, the Examiner stated that the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 24 was otherwise deemed allowable. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's § 112 rejection of claim 24.

In claim 24, the Applicant recites that the message broker further provides non-repudiation of message relay and screening in order to provide proof of message exchange transaction. Generally, non-repudiation regards communication security and the ability to prove that a message has been sent and/or received. Support for such security features can be found in the specification on page 35, lines 8 - 13, page 37, lines 12 - 23, and on page 39, line 21 - page 40, line 15. For example, the SMBs 310 of page 39, line 21 - page 40, line 15 describe non-repudiation features associated with screening and relaying of messages. The SMBs 310 derive this capability from the DMBs (see e.g., page 39, lines 15 - 17).

The Applicant maintains that the specification sufficiently enables one skilled in the art to make and use the non-repudiation features of claim 24 without undue

experimentation. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 112, First Paragraph, rejection.

Claims 25 - 35 and 39, 40, and 44 - 47

In claim 25, the Applicant recites a method for providing exchange of messages and associated data across a plurality of communication network system entities for a plurality of communications networks. The method includes, among other things, steps of configuring a message broker, receiving and processing one or more messages from the system entities, configuring an integrated service controller and configuring processing modules thereof. The method has been amended to incorporate the language of claim 48 (now canceled) such that it includes a step of providing non-repudiation of message relay and screening in order to provide proof of a message exchange transaction. Claim 48 recites essentially the same language of claim 24 and, although otherwise deemed allowable, was similarly rejected under § 112, First Paragraph. Accordingly, the arguments that applied to claim 24 also apply herein. In this regard, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's § 112, First Paragraph, rejection.

Based on the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter contained in claim 24, the Applicant believes that claim 25, as amended, is allowable. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests such disposition. Claims 26 - 35 and 39, 40, and 44 - 47 depend from independent claim 25 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim. These claims, however, require additional subject matter that further distinguishes over the cited references, either alone or in combination. For

example, claim 28 recites a step of relaying the one or more messages to an appropriate destination based on at least one high-level name incorporated into the one or more messages. This language is essentially the same as the language recited in claim 4. Accordingly, the arguments that applied to claim 4 also apply herein. In this regard, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 28. Additionally, the arguments that applied to claim 23 also apply to claim 47 and the applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance thereof. For at least the reasons described in the arguments for claim 25, the Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 26, 27, 29 - 35 and 39, 40, and 44 - 46.

New Claim 54

In claim 54, the Applicant recites a system for providing an exchange of messages and associated data across a plurality of communication network system entities for a plurality of communications networks. This system includes, among other things, a distributed message broker that provides non-repudiation of message relay and screening in order to provide proof of message exchange transaction. Such is believed patentable based on the arguments for claim 24. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 54.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such disposition. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

Date: April 18, 2007

By: /GREGORY T. FETTIG/
Gregory T. Fettig
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(720) 562-5509